OECD WORKSHOP: BEST PRACTICES IN ASSESSING THE SOCIAL COSTS OF SELECTED CHEMICALS -- DRAFT AGENDA

Date: 30-31 August 2017¹ Location: Ottawa, Canada

Background:

OECD's Joint Meeting of the Chemicals Committee and the Working Party on Chemicals, Pesticides and Biotechnology and the Working Party on Integrating Environment and Economic Policies under OECD's Environment Policy Committee are co-operating on a project to develop better methods for quantification and monetisation of morbidity and environmental impacts of chemicals, and to make estimates of the social costs of these impacts of selected chemicals. This work contributes to an EU-financed project on "Supporting the socio-economic analysis of chemicals by allowing a better quantification and monetisation of morbidity and environmental impacts" – SACAME.

As part of this project, a workshop was held in Helsinki on 6-8 July 2016, hosted and co-financed by the European Chemicals Agency, ECHA, and with additional financing provided by the American Chemistry Council. Information regarding this workshop is available on the OECD website at: http://www.oecd.org/environment/tools-evaluation/sacame.htm.

One of the recommendations of the workshop was that a follow-up workshop should be held to compare cases drawing upon experience from chemicals already undergoing risk management activity in more than one country in order to help compare approaches, apply methodologies and learn lessons.

Objective:

Through the sharing and analysis of concrete case studies, this workshop has the objective to discuss best practices in assessing the social costs of management of selected chemicals. Social costs include both private costs (such as costs to business) and externalities (such as the cost to society of environmental pollution). The workshop will focus mainly on valuation of the benefits to society of managing chemicals but also include discussion of the valuation of the costs to business in the context of the case studies.

Discussion will include: summary of the main endpoints of concern (human and/or ecological); summary of the uses targeted by the risk management activity; if it was possible to value the endpoints of concern; what were the data gaps or methodological gaps in the economic assessment(s); what were differences in the endpoints or methods used in the valuation between different the economic assessments between countries; how can the economic valuation be improved; how did the economic assessment inform the regulatory decision-making?

¹ NOTE: The workshop will be followed by a ½ day meeting on the morning of Friday 1 September on the OECD project on conducting a coordinated valuation study for endpoints related to chemicals. Please contact the Secretariat for more information if you wish to participate in that meeting.

| | Wednesday 30 August 2017 | |
|----------------|--|--|
| | Opening Session | |
| 8:30 - 9:00 | Arrival and registration | |
| 9:00 - 9:15 | Welcome and introduction by OECD and Canada | |
| 9:15 – 9:45 | Keynote presentation – James Hammitt , Harvard University | |
| | Mercury-containing Compounds Case Study Chaired by Hugo Waeterschoot, Eurometaux | |
| 9:45 – 10:00 | Introduction to the case study by Canada, based on their experiences What did the regulation target and why; experience in conducting the associated SEA; particular challenges | Joe Devlin, Environment • Canada |
| 10:00 - 10:15 | EU presentation on experience in restricting mercury under REACH | Christoph Rheinberger, • European Chemicals Agency |
| 10:15 – 10:25 | Q&A and open discussion | • |
| 10: 25 – 10:45 | Coffee break | |
| 10:45 – 11:05 | Presentation of a background paper comparing • approaches for mercury Which endpoints were targeted, which endpoints were valued, variation in valuation between approaches, opportunities for improving valuations. | Richard Dubourg, The Economics Interface |
| 11:05 – 11:35 | Prepared comments • | James Hammitt, Harvard • University and Vic Adamowicz, University of Alberta |
| | Q&A and open discussion | • |
| 12:00 - 13:15 | Lunch | |
| | Formaldehyde Case Study Chaired by Michael Donohue, Health Canada | |
| 13:15 – 13:35 | Introduction to case study by the United States • based on their experience in setting emission standards for composite wood products. What did the regulation target and why; experience in conducting the associated SEA; particular challenges | Cody Rice, US EPA • |
| 13:35 – 13:45 | Q&A and open discussion | • |
| 13:45 – 14:05 | Presentation of a background paper regarding approaches for formaldehyde | Alistair Hunt, University of Bath |

| | Which endpoints were targeted, which endpoints were valued, variation in valuation between approaches, opportunities for improving valuations. | |
|----------------|---|---|
| 14:05 – 14:35 | Prepared comments • | Maureen Cropper, University of Maryland and Rana Roy, Consulting Economist |
| 14:35 – 15:00 | Q&A and open discussion | • |
| 15:00 - 15:30• | Coffee Break | |
| C | Phthalates Case Study haired by Stavros Georgiou, Health and Safety Executive, U | nited Kingdom |
| 15:30 – 15:50 | Introduction to case study by ECHA, based on their experience in restricting phthalates under REACH What did the restrictions target and why; experience in conducting the associated SEA; particular challenges | Evgenia Stoyanova, • European Chemicals Agency |
| 15:50 – 16:00 | Q&A and open discussion | • |
| 16:00 – 16:20 | Presentation of a background paper regarding approaches for phthalates Variation in valuation between approaches, opportunities for improving valuations | Mike Holland, Ecometrics • Research and Consulting – EMRC |
| 16:20 – 16:50 | Prepared comments • | Anna Alberini, University • of Maryland and Leo Trasande, New York University |
| 16:50 – 17:30 | Q&A and open discussion | • |

| | Thursday 31 August 2017 | | |
|-------------|--|---|--|
| | PFOA and Salts Case Study Chaired by Cody Rice, US EPA | | |
| 9:00 - 9:20 | • Introduction to case study by Germany based on their experience in restricting PFOA and its salts under REACH. | Karen Thiele, Federal Environment Agency, Germany | |
| | What did the restrictions target and why; experience in conducting the associated SEA; particular challenges | • | |
| 9:20 - 9:30 | Q&A and open discussion | | |

| 9:30 – 9:50 | Presentation of a background paper examining • approaches for PFOA and its salts Variation in valuation between approaches, opportunities for improving valuation(s) | Silke Gabbert, Wageningen University |
|----------------|--|--|
| 9:50 – 10:20 | Prepared comments • | Anthony Footitt, Risk & • Policy Analysts, RPA and Kai Schubert, FluoroCouncil |
| 10:20-10:40 | Q&A and open discussion | • |
| 10:40 - 11:00• | Coffee Break | |
| | NMP Case Study Chaired by Thea Marcelia Sletten, Norwegian Environment | ent Agency |
| 11:00 – 11:15 | Introduction to the case study by the Netherlands based on their experience in restricting NMP and its salts under REACH. What do the restrictions target and why; experience in conducting the associated SEA; particular challenges | Rob Jongeneel, National Institute for Public Health and the Environment, the Netherlands |
| 11:15 – 11:30 | US experience in drafting a proposed rule for NMP | Cody Rice, US EPA • |
| 11:30 - 11:45 | Q&A and open discussion | • |
| 11:45 – 12:05 | Presentation of a background paper regarding approaches for NMP Variation in valuation between approaches, opportunities for improving valuations | Alistair Hunt, University o€ Bath |
| 12:05 – 12:35 | Prepared comments • | Milan Ščasný, Charles University and Roy Brouwer, University of Waterloo |
| 12:35 – 13:00 | Q&A and open discussion | • |
| 13:00 – 14:00• | Lunch | |
| | Horizontal Learnings Chaired by Matti Vainio, European Chemicals Age | ency |
| 14:00 – 14:20 | Presentation of a horizontal analysis of the 5 cases, comparing and contrasting the valuation that was conducted for similar endpoints and/or similar regulated uses to identify opportunities for further harmonisation of approaches. | Ståle Navrud, Norwegian University of Life Sciences |
| 14:20 – 14:40 | Prepared comments | Alan Krupnick, Resources for the Future, RFF, and Lisa Robinson, Harvard University |

| 14:40 – 15:00 | Discussion on the extent to which estimated costs could be "representative" for the social costs of other chemicals or groups of chemicals. | | | |
|-----------------|--|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | General Discussion on Conclusions Chaired by Nils Axel Braathen, OECD | | | |
| 15:00 – 15:15 | Building on the preceding sessions, this session will start with a comment on the cross-cutting conclusions that can be drawn, on any emerging policy implications, and on suggestions for further work. | Rana Roy, Consulting Economist | | |
| 15:15 – 15:45 | Open discussion | | | |
| 15:45 – 16:15 | Coffee break | | | |
| Discu | ssion on a future on-going forum for Risk Management Di Chaired by Eeva Leinala , OECD | scussions at OECD | | |
| 16:15 – 17:00 | Discussion of potential models for an on-going forum to learn from approaches, share best practices and further advance the practical application of socioeconomic impact assessment of chemicals. | | | |
| Closing Session | | | | |
| | Closing Session | | | |